

REMARKS

The Applicant appreciates the courteous and complete examination of the application by the Examiner. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, a reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested.

The Examiner imposes an election/restriction to claims 15-34 as they do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

PROVISIONAL ELECTION OF CLAIMS WITH TRAVERSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.143

The Applicant provisionally elects claims 15-17, 19-21, 23, 24, 28 and 29 with traverse, and withdraws claims 18, 22, 25-27 and 30-34 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof for possible future rejoinder.

In order to expedite the prosecution of this application, claims 19 and 20 have been amended to more definitely point out and distinctly claim the elected species. Claims 15-17, 19-21, 23, 24, 28 and 29 are now in this application.

The Applicant would like to point out that the provisional elected claims 15-17, 19-21, 23, 24, 28 and 29 are related to species 3, figures 3 and 4. It can be appreciated that all the species of invention are directed towards a connector system for detachably interconnecting a number of strips each having at least one perforation which in at least one mutual connection position is flushed with at least one perforation in the other strips, said connector system comprising. Dependent claims 2-28 and 30-34 only limit the common and generic invention indicated above and claimed in independent claims 15 and 29. Therefore the restriction is believed to be in error and reconsideration and withdrawal thereof is requested.

The Applicant provisionally elects species 3, figures 3 and 4, and respectfully believes that the Examiner is in error in the above restriction requirement and in that there is no generic claims.

Claim 15 reads upon species 23 with regards to figures 3 and 4, in that species 3 contains at least one pin (20) having a stem (20a) and a head (20b), at least one hook (17), and wherein the pin (20) is engagable with the flushed perforations (4) in the strips (2a, 2b). Support for which is found in paragraphs [0070, [0071] and [0072].

It can be appreciated that independent claim 15 is generic since all the claimed limitations are contained in species 1-10, figures 1-12. The "at least one pin having a stem and a head" limitation in claim 15 is described as reference numerals: (6, 6a, 6b) in species 1 paragraph [0059], (6, 6a, 6b) in species 2 paragraph [0067], (20, 20a, 20b) in species 3 paragraph [0070], (25, 25a, 25b) in species 4 paragraph [0076], (30) in species 5 as illustrated in figure 7 which includes a stem and a head, (6, 6a, 6b) in species 6 as illustrated in figure 8, (37) in species 7 as illustrated in figure 9 which includes a stem and a head, (6) in species 8 as illustrated in figure 10 which includes a stem and a head, and (6) in species 9 as illustrated in figure 11 which includes a stem and a head.

The "at least one hook" limitation in claim 15 is also believed to be generic since they are contained in all the species. The at least one hook is described as reference numerals: (5) in species 1 paragraph [0059], (11) in species 2 paragraph [0065], (17) in species 3 paragraph [0070], (22) in species 4 paragraph [0074], (27) in species 5 paragraph [0078], (5) in species 6 paragraph [0084], (27) in species 7 paragraph [0086], (39) in species 8 paragraph [0090], and (43) in species 9 paragraph [0097].

Claim 16 reads upon species 3 in that it is clearly illustrated in figures 3 and 4 that the pin (20) has a diameter larger than the diameter of the perforations (4). Particularly, the dotted-lines representing the perforations (4) have a smaller diameter than the solid lines representing the diameter of the pin head (20b). It can be appreciated that claim 16 is generic since this limitation is contained in species 1-10, and illustrated in there corresponding figures 1-12. Support for this generic limitation is also found in paragraphs [0105] which states "As seen in FIG. 1-11 the pin 6 is shaped with a head 6b a little larger than the diameter of the perforations 4 and a stem 6a".

Claim 17 reads upon species 3 in that species 3 contains the pin (20) which further comprises at least one extension that is clearly illustrated in figures 3 and 4 by the larger diameter disc extending out from the pin stem (20a). Figures 3 and 4 clearly illustrate the extension as having a larger diameter than the perforations (4). Additionally, support for this generic limitation is found in paragraphs [0105] which states "The stem further comprises one extension 6c encircling the stem and serving as one or more extra "heads" of the pin. This circular extensions also have a diameter

which is larger than the diameter of the at least one perforation 4, ensuring that even if one strip is removed, the remaining strip(s) is still firmly secured in the connector.”

Claim 19 has been amended to dependent from generic claim 15, and which reads upon species 3 in that species 3 contains at least one hook part (17) which is attached to the pin (20), a second hook part (18) extending from the first hook part (17), and a third hook part (19). Support for these limitations can be found in figures 3 and 4 and paragraphs [0070, [0071] and [0072] which describes figures 3 and 4.

The “at least one first hook part” limitation in claim 19 is believed to be generic since it is contained in all the species. The first hook part is described as reference numerals: (5) in species 1 paragraph [0059], (11) in species 2 paragraph [0065], (17) in species 3 paragraph [0070], (22) in species 4 paragraph [0074], (27) in species 5 paragraph [0078], (5) in species 6 paragraph [0084], (27) in species 7 paragraph [0086], (39) in species 8 paragraph [0090], and (43) in species 9 paragraph [0097].

The “a second hook part” limitation in claim 19 is also believed to be generic since it is contained in all the species. The second hook part is described as reference numerals: (8) in species 1 paragraph [0061], (14) in species 2 paragraph [0066], (18) in species 3 paragraph [0070], (23) in species 4 paragraph [0074], (28) in species 5 paragraph [0079], (8) in species 6 paragraph [0084], (28) in species 7 paragraph [0086] which corresponds to figure 7, (40') in species 8 paragraph [0092], and (44) in species 9 paragraph [0099].

Additionally, the “a third hook part” limitation in claim 19 is believed to be generic since it is contained in all the species. The third hook part is described as reference numerals: (9) in species 1 paragraph [0061], (15) in species 2 paragraph [0066], (19) in species 3 paragraph [0070], (24) in species 4 paragraph [0074], (29) in species 5 paragraph [0079], (9) in species 6 paragraph [0084], (29) in species 7 paragraph [0087] which corresponds to figure 7, (41') in species 8 paragraph [0092], and (45') in species 9 paragraph [0099].

Claim 20 has been amended to read upon species 3 in that figures 3 and 4 clearly illustrates the distance from the axis of pin (20) to the second hook part (18) is at least half of the width of the strips (2a, 2b).

Claim 21 reads upon species 3 in that the distance from the axis of the pin (20) to the second hook part (18) is larger than half of the width of the strips (2a, 2b), support of which is found in paragraphs [0070] and [0071].

Claim 23 reads upon species 3 in that figures 3 and 4 clearly illustrates the first hook part (17) and the third hook part (19) forming an angle with each other, support of which is found in paragraph [0070]. Since the first hook part (17) and the third hook part (19) do not exist on the same plan then they must have an angle between them.

Claim 24 reads upon species 3 in that it further describes the angle of claim 23 and therefore further describes the angle between the first hook part (17) and the third hook part (19) of species 3.

Claim 28 reads upon species 3 in that the Examiner states that claim 28 reads on species 10 and that species 10 is directed to figure 12. Paragraphs [0102] states that "FIG. 12 shows in an exploded view a fraction of the connector 16 with a screw joint 33 for detachably attaching the pin 20 of the connector 16 of the fourth embodiment, shown in FIGS. 3 and 4, with the first hook part 17 of said connector." The Applicant respectfully points out that since figure 12, as stated in paragraph [0102], is actually directed to figures 3 and 4, and figures 3 and 4 are directed to species 3 as indicated by the Examiner, then claim 28 reads upon species 3.

Independent claim 29 reads upon species 3, with regards to figures 3 and 4, in that species 3 contains at least one pin (20) having a stem (20a) and a head (20b), at least one hook including a first hook, part (17), a second hook part (18), and a third hook part (19), and wherein the pin (20) is engagable with the flushed perforations (4) in the strips (2a, 2b). Additionally, figures 3 and 4 clearly illustrates the pin (20) and head (20b) being insertable through the perforation (4). It can be appreciated that independent claim 29 is generic since all the claimed limitations are contained in species 1-10, figures 1-12, as described above in independent claim 15.

Claim 30 reads upon species 2 in that species two contains a substantially isosceles triangular shape. Support for this limitation is found in paragraph [0065] which states "a first hook part 11 consisting of a mainly isosceles triangle 12 merging into a rectangle 13".

The Applicant respectfully believes, as proven from the above arguments, that claims 15, 16, 17, 19 and 29 are generic. Therefore since independent claims 15 and 29 are believed to be generic, then the withdrawn claims should be in condition for rejoinder if independent claims 15 and 29 are allowed since all the withdrawn claims dependent from a generic claim.

With the above amendments being fully responsive to all outstanding rejections and formal requirements, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner feel that there are further issues which might be resolved by means of telephone interview, the Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned at (403) 444-5695, or email at davidguerra@internationalpatentgroup.com

A two month extension of time fee of \$230.00 is provided.

Respectfully Submitted,

/David A. Guerra/

David A. Guerra, Reg. 46,443

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO, electronically transmitted using EFS-Web, or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Mail Stop Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

On (Date) 01/11/2008 by David A. Guerra /David A. Guerra/